

Application No. 10/530,231
Response dated: June 11, 2007
In Reply to Office action dated: March 9, 2007

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1, 2, 7B and 8B. The changes reflect removal of light-polarization indicating arrows.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

The above amendments are made in response to the Office action of March 9, 2007. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks. No new matter has been added, amendments have been made for purposes of clarifying the claimed invention.

Claims 1-5 and 9 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1-5 can be found FIGS. 1, 2, 5-8B and line 13 of page 7 through line 14 of page 8 of the specification as filed. Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application.

Specification

The specification reflects various changes to clarify the detailed description. The amendments contain no new matter.

Drawings

Applicants have included replacement drawing as described above.

No new matter has been introduced by the new drawings as support is found throughout the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed.

Consideration and entry of the Replacement Drawing Sheets for FIGS. 1, 2, 7B and 8B are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 9 was objected to for informalities. Applicant has corrected the informalities in claim 9 by changing the claim to read "fourth light," as described in the specification and illustrated in FIGS. 2.

Applicants respectfully request that in light of the present amendments the objections to claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3

U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements “arranged as in the claim.” *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1274 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Missing elements may not be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art or the disclosure of another reference. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 780, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 9

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Maeda (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,422, hereinafter “Maeda”). The Examiner states that Maeda discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims.

Maeda is directed to a transfective liquid crystal device with bright reflective display. (See Abstract). Maeda discloses a display device 100 including a polarizer 14, a liquid crystal panel 10, a light scattering member 15, a polarized light separator 16 and a light source 17. (See FIG. 1 and column 8, line 12 through column 12, line 63.) The polarized light separator 16 transmits light of a first polarity and reflects light of a polarity substantially orthogonal to the first polarity. (See FIGS. 2-4 and 23, and column 8, line 40 through column 9, line 27). The polarized light separator 16 and the scattering member 15 are separated from one another. (See FIGS. 2 and 23).

Maeda does not disclose, teach or suggest **a polarizing member which includes a polarizing layer and a light-diffusing layer integrally formed with the polarizing layer** as claimed in independent claims 1 and 4 of the present invention. The polarized light separator 16 and the scattering member 15 of Maeda are not integrally formed.

Thus, claims 1 and 4 are believed to be patentably distinct and not anticipated by Maeda. Claim 3 depends directly from claim 1, and thus includes all of the limitations of claim 1. Claim 9 depends directly from claim 4, and thus includes all of the limitations of claim 4. It is thus believed that dependent claims 3 and 9 are allowable for at least the reasons given for independent claims 1 and 4, which are believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4 and 9 in view of Maeda.

Claims 1-6, 9 and 10

Claims 1-6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Iijima. (U.S. Patent No. 6,906,767, hereinafter "Iijima"). The Examiner has stated that Iijima discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims.

Iijima is directed to an LCD with diffuser having a particular haze value and diffuser-reflector distance, and reduced parallax. (See Abstract). Iijima discloses a display device 10 including an upper polarizing plate 12, a liquid crystal display panel 20, a light diffusion plate 30, a lower polarizing plate 15, a reflection polarizing plate 40, a light source 70 and a light reflection plate 80. (See FIG. 5 and column 11, line 40 through column 13, line 49). The lower polarizing plate 15 of Iijima is disposed above a reflection polarizing plate 40, which in turn is disposed above a light source 70 in FIG. 5, and the polarizing plate 15 is disposed above a light diffusion plate 30 and a reflection polarizing plate 40, which in turn is disposed above a light source 70 in FIG. 7. The polarizing plate 15 and the light diffusion plate 30 are separated from one another. (See FIG. 5 and FIG. 7).

Iijima does not disclose, teach or suggest **a polarizing member which includes a polarizing layer and a light-diffusing layer integrally formed with the polarizing layer**, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 4 of the present invention. The polarizing plate 15 and the light diffusion plate 30 are clearly separated.

Thus, independent claims 1 and 4 are believed to be patentably distinct and not anticipated by Iijima. Claims 2 and 3 depend directly from claim 1, and thus include all of the limitations of claim 1. Claims 5, 6, 9 and 10 depend from claim 4, and thus include all of the limitations of claim 4. It is thus believed that dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10 are allowable for at least the reasons given for independent claims 1 and 4, which are believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 9 and 10 in view of Iijima.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 and 8

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iijima in view of Kawamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,809,782, hereinafter "Kawamoto"). The Examiner has stated that Iijima in view of Kawamoto teaches all of the limitations of claims 7 and 8.

As mentioned above for amended independent claim 4, Iijima neither teaches nor suggests **a polarizing member which includes a polarizing layer and a light-diffusing layer integrally formed with the polarizing layer** as claimed in independent claim 4 of the present invention.

Kawamoto is directed to a display including a diffusing layer 11, a linearly polarized light separator 12 and a light absorbing layer 13. The display also includes a liquid crystal cell 2 and an absorbing polarizer 3. (See FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 37-49). The diffusing layer 11 and the linearly polarized light separator 13 are separately formed.

Kawamoto, however, fails to cure the deficiencies of Iijima with respect to independent claim 4, namely, Kawamoto fails to teach or suggest **a polarizing member which includes a polarizing layer and a light-diffusing layer integrally formed with the polarizing layer**, as claimed in independent claim 4.

Thus, Applicants submit that neither Iijima nor Kawamoto, alone or in combination, render obvious the subject matter of claim 4. Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 4, and thus include the allowable elements of claim 4. It is thus believed that the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above for independent claim 4.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references. The Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 8, and the subsequent allowance of claims 7 and 8, is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/530,231
Response dated: June 11, 2007
In Reply to Office action dated: March 9, 2007

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, the present application including claims 1-11 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections. If there are any charges due with respect to this response, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' Attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
John W. Stankiewicz
Registration No. 60,169
Confirmation No. 1269
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115

Date: June 11, 2007